

REMARKS

This amendment accompanies a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). New claims 162 and 163 are added and contain no new matter. Claims 144, 146-147 and 149-152 are amended to depend from claim 162, and claims 154, 156 and 158-161 are amended to depend from claim 163. Claims 143, 145, 148, 153, 155 and 157 are cancelled. Thus, claims 144, 146-147, 149-152, 154, 156 and 158-163 are in this application.

It is submitted that claims 144, 146-147, 149-152, 154, 156 and 158-161, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

In the Final Office Action dated February 19, 2003, claims 143-161 were rejected as unpatentable over Klingler et al. (Patent No. 5,404,316), Langford et al. (Patent No. 5,206,929) and Carlucci et al. (Patent No. 5,191,645).

Claims 143 and 153 have been cancelled and replaced with new independent claims 162 and 163.

Claim 162 is representative and recites:

“An editing system comprising:

a plurality of modules for selectively performing one or more of editing, composing, and special effects processing on a plurality of clips to produce a first resultant clip, said modules being operable to perform processing on said first resultant clip to produce a second resultant clip; and

display means for displaying a table of horizontally aligned rows and vertically aligned columns, said table including at least textual indicia identifying those clips subjected to said processing to produce said first resultant clip, and said indicia indicating the type of processing

performed on said clips, said table further identifying the second resultant clip produced as a result of processing performed on said first resultant clip, and indicating the type of processing performed thereon.”

(Emphasis added).

An example of a table displayed by the claimed display means is illustrated in Fig. 13 of the present application. The table in Fig. 13 includes rows and columns showing textual indicia identifying the clips which appear in Applicants' Fig. 4. Consider the entries for a first resultant clip identified by the Clip ID Code "008," in the eighth row of the table in Fig. 13. In the column labeled "Child Link ID Code," at the eighth row of that column, the reference numerals "003," "002" and "001" (Clip ID Codes) identify the three clips subjected to processing to produce first resultant clip "008." Further, in the column labeled "Module ID Code," at the tenth row of that column, the letter "C" indicates the type of processing, Composing Processing, performed on clips "003," "002" and "001" in producing first resultant clip "008." In a similar manner, textual indicia in the tenth row of the table indicates that a second resultant clip, clip "010," is produced by performing Editing Processing (denoted by "E" in the Module ID Code column) on the first resultant clip "008" and the clip having ID code "009" (respectively identified in the Child Link ID Code column).

The Examiner relies on Klingler, in particular, Figures 17, 15 and 5, for disclosing the claimed display means. Applicants submit, however, that Klingler, even when supplemented by the Carlucci and Langford patents, fails to suggest a "display means for displaying a table of horizontally aligned rows and vertically aligned columns, said table including at least textual indicia identifying those clips subjected to said processing to produce said first resultant clip, and said indicia indicating the type of processing performed on said clips, said table further

identifying the second resultant clip produced as a result of processing performed on said first resultant clip, and indicating the type of processing performed thereon.”

Instead, Fig. 17 of Klingler illustrates a “Time View Window 240” wherein a so-called “horizontal strip” 112 displays icons associated with clips. Klingler’s Fig. 15 illustrates a so-called “warp window” 210, wherein the first and last frames of a clip are also identified by icons displayed in windows 152, 154. A grid 211, 213 is superimposed onto the displayed icons to create a “warp effect” selected from a category box 214 and an effect box 216. Klingler’s Fig. 5 illustrates a so-called Story Board 72 upon which icons corresponding to the clips 106, 108, 110 are arranged in an order to be played. Thus, Klingler’s Figs. 17, 15 and 5 fail to disclose, for example, textual indicia identifying the clips and the type of processing performed thereon. Klingler’s figures show, instead, icons associated with clips. Further, it becomes particularly clear in a side-by-side comparison that Figs. 17, 15 and 5 of Klingler bears no resemblance to Applicants’ Fig. 13 exemplifying the claimed display means.

The Examiner also contends that Fig. 10 of Carlucci teaches elements of the claimed display means. However, Fig. 10 of Carlucci fails to show even a table comprised of columns and rows. Instead, Fig. 10 shows a display merely including icons, similar to Klingler. The Examiner does not rely on Langford for disclosing the claimed display means. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has found no reference that describes a “display means for displaying a table of horizontally aligned rows and vertically aligned columns, said table including at least textual indicia identifying those clips subjected to said processing to produce said first resultant clip, and said indicia indicating the type of processing performed on said clips, said table further identifying the second resultant clip produced as a result of processing performed on said first resultant clip, and indicating the type of processing performed thereon.”

Applicants, by their attorney, have made a diligent effort to point out how their claimed invention is patentably distinct over the prior art particularly relied upon by the Examiner. It is urged that the present application now is in condition for allowance; and notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nevertheless, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone Applicants' attorney if discussions of this application would be helpful in advancing its prosecution.

Statements appearing above in respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the undersigned attorney and, in the event the Examiner disagrees with any of such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By:



William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800